

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-5 and 7-14 are currently pending.

Claim Objections

Claim 8 has been amended to remove the duplicative phrase, "wherein the at least one Web page comprises a sub-plurality of the plurality of Web pages." Therefore, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the objection to this claim.

Rejection of claims 1 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) by Hussey (USP No. 6,230,156) in view of Navin-Chandra et al. (USP No. 6,275,820)

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 9-11 by combining the two references Hussey and Navin-Chandra et al. It should be noted that Hussey discloses an electronic mail interface for a network server for processing SQL queries; whereas, Navin-Chandra et al. disclose a system and method for integrating search results from heterogeneous information sources. As understood in the art, processing SQL queries are different from performing searches with search engines as disclosed in Navin-Chandra et al. Therefore, Hussey and Navin-Chandra et al. cannot be combined to reject claims 1 and 9-11, for the resulting combined system and method would not work, and they would render the prior art unsatisfactory for the intended purpose. See MPEP 2145(X)(D). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 9-11 are allowable over the references of record.

Rejection of claims 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) by Hussey, Navin-Chandra et al., and Mantha et al. (USP No. 6,163,779)

Claim 2 is allowable for the same reasons set forth above for the allowability of claims 1 and 9-11. Furthermore, as stated in Mantha et al. and admitted by the Examiner, Mantha et al. disclose copying webpage to the client local storage (e.g., client PC hard drive). Thus, there is no

obvious reason to bundle the copied web page in an e-mail message for sending to the client. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is allowable over the references of record.

Rejection of claims 3, 5, 7, and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) by Navin-Chandra et al.

As pointed out by the Examiner, Navin-Chandra et al. disclose in Col. 11, lines 58-67 that each of the search engine results being a *portion* of a respective original document. Therefore, there is no bundling of a copy of at least *one* entire web page into an e-mail message for forwarding the user's terminal as claimed and asserted by the Examiner to be disclosed by Navin-Chandra et al. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 5, 7, 13, and 14 are allowable over the references of record.

Rejection of claims 4, 8 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) by Navin-Chandra et al. in view of Mantha et al.

Claims 4, 8 and 12 are allowable for the same reasons set forth above for the allowability of claims 3, 5, 7, 13 and 14. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, Mantha et al. disclose coping a web page to the client local storage (e.g., client PC hard drive). Thus, there is no obvious reason to bundle the copied web page in an e-mail message for sending to the client.

Conclusion

For at least all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention is neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record, and the claims now pending patentably distinguish the present invention from the references of record. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited upon the filing of a continuation.

Serial No. 09/409,748

-8-


Docket No. CITI0127-US

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/2/03

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
607 14th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 508-5800
GTM/THN/C0464.175440/CITI0127

By:


Tiep H. Nguyen
Registration No. 44,465